April 8, 2014

Addendum 2

RFP # 7548519

Statewide E-Permitting Software System

Department of Administration

Closing Date and Time: April 28, 2014, 2:00 PM ET

NOTICE

The closing date and time have been changed from:

April 17, 2014, 10:00 AM ET   TO:

Monday, April 28, 2014, 2:00 PM ET

Note: Interested vendors should continue to monitor the Purchasing Website for additional addenda, at least one of which will be issued to revise the requirement for a Performance Bond. See Answer 11 below.

The answers to all questions received by the questions deadline are published below.

Solicitation Amendments (bidders should modify and/or respond accordingly):

Excel Spreadsheet "7548519 Proposal Requirements", Tab 01, Req. # 1.022 is hereby deleted.
Excel Spreadsheet "7548519 Proposal Requirements", Tab 06, Req. # 6.012 is hereby deleted.
Excel Spreadsheet "7548519 Proposal Requirements", Tab 11, Req. 11.030 is hereby deleted.
Excel Spreadsheet "7548519 Proposal Requirements", Tab 13, Req. 13.016 is hereby deleted.

Solicitation Amendments, continued (bidders should modify and/or respond accordingly):

Excel Spreadsheet "7548519 Proposal Requirements", Tab 14, Req. # 14.012 is hereby modified to read: "The external web interfaces for public, licensees, and vendors must allow the use of various commercially available browsers including Internet Explorer ver 9+, Firefox ver 26+, Safari 5+, and Chrome 33+.

Excel Spreadsheet "7548519 Proposal Requirements", Tab 14, Req. # 14.015 is hereby modified to read: "The staff user interface should work with commercially available browsers other than Internet Explorer, specifically Firefox ver 26+, Safari 5+, and Chrome 33+.

---**End of Solicitation Amendments**------------------------------------

RFP 7548519 Questions and Answers

Question 1 - Will the request for proposal due date be extended to allow vendors to adjust proposals based on the State's answers to inquiries?
Answer 1 - Yes, the RFP due date has been extended from Thursday April 3, 2014 to Monday April 28, 2014.

Question 2 - What system is the State currently using for statewide e-permitting software?
Answer 2 - The State does not have a current e-permitting system.

Question 3 - Can the cost proposal template be modified?
Answer 3 - No, to ensure uniformity and equity, all cost proposals must be submitted on the prescribed form, Attachment A. Vendors may append additional information, but the evaluated price shall be the total fixed fee cost for the initial contract period, cell C30 on the Attachment A. Licensing Costs for the initial contract period, if any, should be included in Task 3, cell C8 on Attachment A. For operational years 1 through 4, licensing costs should be included in Number D, cells D through G 29.

Question 4 - Will an oral presentation be part of the scoring criteria?
Answer 4 - The State will not require oral presentations as part of the bid process. However, the review committee may request that bidder clarify statements or elements made in their proposal.

Question 5 - The RFP references a MBE requirement. Will the State accept a proposed MBE that is in-progress of submitting their Rhode Island certification paperwork?
Answer 5 - Approval of a MBE plan is required before issuance of a purchase order to an awarded vendor; this process can be initiated after receipt of a tentative award letter.

Question 6 - Staff qualifications must be submitted for the staff who will be involved with the project. Is this the staff required for Phase I of the project or Phase I and Phase II?
Answer 6 - Phase I.

Question 7 - The RFP states that the technical proposal is limited to 6 pages plus appendices. Our documents (e.g. Statement of work, resumes, technical architecture description, etc.) typically far exceed 6 pages. Should we include anything over 6 pages as an appendix?
Answer 7 - The technical architecture and hardware/software solution section should be limited to 6 pages. Statements of work and resumes are not included in the 6 page requirement.

Question 8 - The RFP notes that all materials submitted for consideration to this RFP will be considered to be public records as defined in Title 38, Chapter 2 of the General Laws of Rhode Island, without exception, and will be released for inspection immediately upon request once an award has been made. Is this Statement saying that no portion of the submitted proposal can be marked confidential and that those confidential documents will be not be withheld from Public Records?
Answer 8 – Section 15 of the State's General Conditions of Purchase reads: **PUBLIC RECORDS** - Contractors and bidders are advised that all documents, correspondence, and other submissions to the Office of Purchases may be accessible as public records, pursuant to Title 38, Chapter 2 of the General

Laws, absent specific notice that portions of such submittals may contain confidential or proprietary information, such that public access to those items should be withheld, and except as otherwise provided for pursuant to RIGL 37-2-18 (a)-(h) "Competitive Sealed Bidding". A vendor may indicate which sections of the proposal it believes is not subject to Public disclosure and cite the specific exemption under RIGL 38-2-2. The Division of Purchases will make the final determination of what should not be disclosed.

Question 9 - Page eleven (11) states that the cost proposal is to be submitted in a separate sealed envelope marked Cost Proposal RFP 7548518. Please clarify if this is a typo and if it should be marked RFP 7548519?
Answer 9 - That is correct. RFP and Cost Proposals are both numbered 7548519.

Question 10 - What is the available budget for this project?
Answer 10 - The budget for this project is subject to appropriation by the general assembly.

Question 11 - Is the performance bond for $580,000 mandatory? Why is there one and what protection does it provide to the State? What Phase does the bond cover?
Answer 11 - The State is reassessing the amount of risk exposure involved with the project, and expects to adjust the performance bond requirement as Addendum 3 to this solicitation, for an amount yet to be determined. Addendum 3 will be issued on or before April 15, 2014, in order to allow vendors sufficient time to process the revised amount identified. This will be a requirement only for the successful vendor, to be certified before issuance of a purchase order. The cost of the bond shall be the responsibility of the contractor.

Question 12 - Is a five percent bid surety required?
Answer 12 - No.

Question 13 - Has the State identified a core project team? How many of the core team members have software administration skills? Will this team be the system administrators for selected solution?
Answer 13 - The core project team will include representatives from Office of Digital Excellence, Office of Management and Budget, Division of Information Technology, State Building Code Commissioner, State Fire Marshal, and State Planning/GIS. Multiple members of this team have software administration skills. The awarded vendor will report to this team.

Question 14 - As part of the training protocol, does the State want to be trained in report writing and development?
Answer 14 – Yes

Question 15 - Please provide a list of the vendors that have provided a demonstration to the State relative to this RFP. How were these vendors selected for demonstration?
Answer 15 - Demonstrations were conducted by business users, without vendor participation. Systems reviewed were Accela, ViewPermit and InQuest.

Question 16 - Does Phase I include two pilot municipalities along with the Building Code Commission and State Fire Marshal? Are these municipalities known and do they have an existing e-permitting solution?

Answer 16 - Yes, there will be two pilot municipalities in Phase I, but they have not been determined at this time. The Office of Management and Budget is currently in the process of recruiting and selecting these municipalities. The selected municipalities will not have a current e-permitting solution. Other specific questions related to the pilot municipalities are not known at this time.

Question 17- Will all municipalities in Rhode Island be included in Phase II?

Answer 17 - It is not known at this time.

Question 18 - What State and municipal resources and staff will be available to support this project (i.e. identifying workflow, fee structures, integration needs, on-boarding and training logistics, etc)?

Answer 18 - Members of the core project team described in Question 12 will be available to support this project. Municipal resources and staff will be identified during Phase II implementation.

Question 19 - What mandates will the State require for municipalities with this system? How much control will municipalities have over selecting design, functionality, and forms?

Answer 19 - Municipal requirements will be identified during Phase II implementation. The State seeks to consolidate forms and processes to the greatest extent possible. The system should support dynamic fields; however standardization will be the guiding principle.

Question 20 - Please provide more background on how the requirements for this project were developed? Was a consultant used? How many municipalities contributed to the requirements?

Answer 20 - The core project team identified in Question 12 developed the requirements for this project. No consultants were used. Additionally, the team has given consideration and requested feedback from municipalities.

Question 21 - How was the timeframe for the implementation of Phase I developed? Is there a specific reason why this must be accomplished during this timeframe?

Answer 21 - The timeline for Phase I is connected to the anticipated implementation of Phase II.

Question 22 - What is the exact scope of the Phase I implementation? Specifically, which plan review, permit applications, and inspection forms and processes are required for Phase I?

Answer 22 - The priority of the permits, licenses, and applications will be determined by the State with the selected vendor prior to the start of Phase I. It is expected that the selected vendor will work with the core project team prior to implementation to develop the full scope of the project. Subsequent answers to questions should further inform potential vendors as to the scope of Phase I.

Question 23 - What is the exact scope of the Phase II implementation? Are there specific deliverables or metrics that are expected coming out of Phase II?

Answer 23 – Specific requirements regarding Phase II are in development. The major deliverable for Phase II is to apply the software solution developed in Phase I to the needs of participating municipalities.

Question 24 - Please provide a breakdown of the 39 cities and towns and their respective current permitting and licensing systems.
Question 24 - This information is not available at this time, but should become available in Phase II.

Question 25 - What is the State's GIS strategy for this project? Is the State going to adopt one GIS provider statewide? Which GIS provider(s) is the State currently using, if any?
Answer 25 - The RIGIS (Rhode Island Geographic Information System) group will be key contributors to this project. The State will seek to utilize RIGIS data and mapping resources where possible, as well as build on the RI contract with ESRI.

Question 26 - Other than GIS and payment gateway, are there any other integration components that are anticipated for Phase I, or Phase II (financials, etc.).
Answer 26 - Integration for GIS and payment gateway are the only anticipated deliverables for Phase I. Data exports for reporting needs for municipalities are unknown at this time.

Question 27 - How will vendor performance be evaluated to determine if the contract can be renewed for Phase II?
Answer 27 - Vendors will be evaluated on their ability to meet the Phase I requirements within the established timeline and budget.

Functionality & Technical Questions - Excel Spreadsheet

Question 28 - Some of the spreadsheet tabs are missing the requirements to respond to.
Answer 28 - Column B, "Requirements" on every numbered tab has text matching the requested response columns E and F.

Question 29 - On the 02-Forms-Outputs tab, can the State identify what permits, licenses, applications, reports, inspection types, etc. would apply to the State Building Commission, State Fire Marshal, and pilot municipalities. Does Phase I include all of the items included on the Outputs tab?
Answer 29 - The State will work with the selected vendor to set a priority listing of permits, licenses, and applications prior to the start of Phase I. The selected vendor should anticipate implementing a software solution for most, if not all, of the items on this tab during Phase I.

Question 30 - Requirement 1.003 references "Routing and Sharing projects between Departments." Please clarify the use of the word "projects"- does this mean workflow crossing departments?
Answer 30 - Yes, workflows could potentially cross between agencies. Multiple agencies should have the ability to comment on and mark up an individual project.

Question 31 - Regarding section 1.022: Can you provide a list of the expected external document management systems?
Answer 31 – Requirement 1.022 has been struck from the RFP.

Question 32 - Regarding section 1.022: Can you provide some indication of how much data is expected to be stored within the proposed system vs. an external document management system?

Answer 32 – Requirement 1.022 has been struck from the RFP. Additionally, most of the current records maintained at the offices of the State Fire Marshal and Building Commissioner, especially plan review, are in paper documents – therefore it is difficult to determine data storage needs within the proposed system at this time.

Question 33 - Regarding section 1.025: Is the expectation that text within a scanned document be blacked out automatically based upon business rules, or will this require human intervention to perform the document modifications?

Answer 33 - It is expected that this functionality would be delivered through a hybrid solution, based on high level business rules and human intervention.

Question 34 - Regarding section 1.082: Please provide more details around the scope of this requirement. Will the vendor be responsible for developing electronic data entry forms for all forms in the section "02 Forms-Outputs"? Can you please provide the current paper or electronic forms for reference?

Answer 34 - The State would expect the vendor to develop electronic data entry forms for those forms identified in Section 02. A priority listing will be developed in conjunction with the core project team. The selected vendor will receive paper copies of all required forms.

Question 35 - Regarding section 1.045: Is the expectation that the list of abutters, and addresses, will be generated based upon a property selection or will the abutters be selected from a map and the list of addresses generated based upon selected properties?

Answer 35 – The solution needs to include the ability to create a list of abutting properties to a selected property that are either immediately adjacent or within a user-specified distance. In order for an Assessor to sign off on the selected abutters, some municipalities may require the capability to modify this selected list of properties by clicking on the screen to add or remove abutters from the list prior to the creation of mailing labels.

Question 36 - Regarding section 1.080: Will the State designate a single administrator that can perform changes (new fields, field labels, page layouts, etc…) or will each municipality designate their own administrator for these tasks?

Answer 36 - The State will designate an administrator, and municipalities should have the security and ability to act as an administrator for their own forms and workflows.

Question 37 - Regarding section 1.083: what process for this communication is needed? Upon an existing vendor signing in to the new system could they be directed to training manual? Is this what is intended by this requirement?

Answer 37 - The intended functionality is that business rules and forms developed for an existing municipality should be able to be transferred and utilized for another municipality with minimal configuration changes.

Question 38 - Regarding section 3.005: "The ability to work with two pilot sites for the implementation of Building Permits and Inspections, Fire Permits and Licenses, Business Licenses, and System Interfaces." Please describe in more detail. What are the forms that are required for Building Permits and Inspections? Fire Permits and Inspections? Business Licenses? What system interfaces are required?
Answer 38 - More detail on municipal forms will be provided to the selected vendor when the two pilot communities are identified.

Question 39 - Regarding section 5.025: This requirement implies that documents will be imported into the system and their contents converted to database records (containing contact information perhaps), then parsed for correctness and finally an email or printed letter generated requesting correction of any errors. Is our interpretation of this requirement correct?
Answer 39 - The system should be able to validate address records and reject unknown or incorrect addresses. The system should display a warning or reject dialogue box, as well as generate an email or report of bad addresses which were rejected.

Question 40 - Regarding section 5.026: This requirement implies the opposite of section 5.025, in that data will be collected in a digital form and parsed for correctness as it is entered, stopping the user from entering further information until errors are corrected. Is our interpretation of this requirement correct?
Answer 40 - Section 5.026 refers to the validation process when data is manually entered into the system. Section 5.025 refers to the validation process in batch mode when data is uploaded separately.

Question 41 - Regarding section 6.012: Requirement is for multiple payment processors while 6.013 require a single payment processor, can you reconcile these two conflicting requests?
Answer 41 - Requirement 6.013 has been struck from the RFP.

Question 42 - Requirement 6.014 indicates funds can be applied to different department's bank accounts. Please clarify to this requirement. For example, if a license is processed within the Fire Marshal's record the funds would be applied to the Fire Marshal's bank account and not the Building Commission, or is this requirement more granular where the License Application payment is processed to one bank account for the Fire Marshal, but the Inspection payment is processed to another bank account for the Fire Marshal.
Answer 42 – Currently, the Fire Marshal and State Building Commission send payments separately to the General Treasury. The goal of the new system would be to allow a user to pay the State once, and have the system allocate the payment to the associated agency.

Question 43 - Regarding section 6.018: This requirement identifies the use of electronically scannable

coding systems to enter a system unique identifier for rapid access to records. Please confirm if the expectation is that all departments and municipalities will standardize on a single coding system, or if there will be multiple coding systems used throughout the implementation.

Answer 43 - Yes, the intent is to standardize on a single coding system.

Question 44 - Regarding section 6.018: This requirement specifies the need to generate electronically readable codes (ex. bar codes). Is there an external system that would produce these codes or will the proposed solution require this capacity, (i.e. Interface with a barcode scanner device.)?

Answer 44 - The system should generate the bar codes or similar machine readable format.

Question 45 - Regarding section 6.019: This requirement identifies the use of scanning and OCR technology. Please confirm if the expectation is that all departments and municipalities will have such technology at their disposal in a standardized way?

Answer 45 - Yes, the intent is to standardize and make the technology available.

Question 46 - Regarding section 10.018: This requirement implies that Customer A (the payor) will have to be given access to Customer B's private information (bills, etc…) was this the intent and will this be deemed acceptable?

Answer 46 - The payor should only be granted access to the specific permits and bills for the project he/she is assigned.

Question 47 - Regarding section 10.051: "The system must allow automated renewal fee assessments to be manually adjusted in order to accommodate reinstating expired licenses where fees may be negotiated." Would the state be amenable to isolating such manual debit and credit adjustments to those users paying either at the counter but not via the online payment option?

Answer 47 - No. The system must provide administrative functionality to allow fees to be adjusted on an exception basis online, according to user permissions.

Question 48 - Regarding section 11.030: "The system must be able to interface to an external full functionality document management system." Please provide details on what system(s) the system will need to integrate with.

Answer 48 - Requirement 11.030 has been struck from the RFP.

Question 49 - Regarding section 11.044: Please define 'Screen optimized screen process'?

Answer 49 - The system should make use of the tab functionality on a keyboard to move within a form or process, versus sole use of the mouse. The system should also have built-in hot keys to perform common actions.

Question 50 - Regarding section 11.060: Please define 'Delivered Field'?

Answer 50 - Delivered fields are standard fields built into the system prior to modification. Custom fields are new input based upon customization of the as-is system.

Question 51 - Regarding section 13.016: "The system should display documents contained in Municipal Document Management system without the need have additional document management license from the document management vendor." Please provide details on the document management systems that the new system must integrate with.

Answer 51 – Requirement 13.016 has been struck from the RFP.

Question 52 - Regarding section 14.011: "The system must have the ability to easily integrate with MS Office products." Please describe this integration requirement in more detail.

Answer 52 - The system should accept MS Office documents as attachments, as well as import from an Excel file. The system should be able to generate a Word document or CSV export for Excel.

Question 53 - Regarding section 14.012: "The external web interfaces for public, licensees, and vendors must allow the use of various commercially available browsers including Internet Explorer ver 7+, Firefox ver 3.5+, Safari 4+, Chrome 11+." Some of the browser versions listed for this requirement are not available for download anymore. For example, Chrome 11 was available in 2011. Currently, Chrome is on v33. Please clarify what browser versions are specifically required to be supported.

Answer 53 - The browser versions have been updated in this amendment to reflect the following: IE 9, Firefox 26, Chrome 33, and Safari 5.

Question 54 - Please identify the number of distinct named back office users the State requires for the new system by agency.

Answer 54 - RI Building Commission – 10 estimated users; RI Fire Marshal – 36 estimated users; municipalities are unknown at this time.

Question 55 - Please list the average number of record types created each year for each of the following in the State's current system by Agency.

Answer 55 – Estimated:

	Building Commission	Fire Marshal
Licenses	7,000	400 Plan Review, 150 Technical
Applications	1,000	150 Technical Services
Work Orders	1,000	400 Plan Review
Service Requests	200	0
Complaints	200	90 Plan Review, 150 Code
Planning Applications	0	400 Plan Review

Pilot Municipalities are not known at this time.

Question 56 - What Permits and Licenses have a renewal process for the State Building Commission, State Fire Marshal, and Pilot Municipalities?

Answer 56 - All permits and licenses under the Building Commission have a renewal process, while 7 permits and licenses under the Fire Marshal have a renewal process. Municipalities are not known at this time.

Question 57 - Please describe the general renewal process for the State Building Commission, State Fire Marshal, and Pilot Municipalities?

Answer 57 - Building Commission renewals typically occur on the same day each year. Amendments to application procedure may occur for new applicants or statutory changes. Permit renewal process generally: 1) vendor obtains forms, 2) submits to appropriate office, 3) office processes, 4) fees collected, and 5) permit issued. Licenses may require applicant to obtain photo for new license.

Question 58 - Which Permits and Licenses have inspections?

Answer 58 - All permits and licenses conducted by the Building Commission have an associated inspection. Seven permit types under the Fire Marshal have an associated inspection. Municipalities are not known at this time.

Question 59 - RFP mentioned a multi-tenant client structure on a single Database. Please provide more details regarding this requirement?

Answer 59 - The system should support multiple agencies and municipalities via a single log-on for the client. The back-end database must be a single instance with one unified schema.

Question 60 - What information will be shared between State agencies and municipalities? Provide examples.

Answer 60 - Agencies and municipalities should be able to access shared business clients, as well as projects that are deemed to cross departments. There may be an opportunity to consolidate forms and workflows; however system security should prevent a municipality from accessing the administrative area of another municipality.

Question 61 - Will the State have a unified portal for all municipalities and the State? Or will each group maintain a different look, feel, page flow, etc?

Answer 61 - The portal should have a similar look and feel between groups; however some elements may need to be customized to fit the community or agency to which they address.

Question 62 - Please estimate the number of reports and custom documents the State would like developed based on High, Medium or Low complexity for scoping purposes by agency.

Answer 62 - Estimated at about 10 High (complex queries, multiple sources, etc.), 20 Medium (calculations, summaries, etc.), and 20 Low (simple reporting on database fields) for each agency or municipality involved.

Question 63 - Does the State plan to use the vendors inherit document management functionality?

Answer 63 - The State expects the vendor solution to include document management capabilities specific to the permit, licensing, and inspection process.

Question 64 - Will the State require a periodic Address, Parcel, and Owner (APO) load into the new, selected system? Please list the system of record for the APO data for this project.

Answer 64 – Address data: The State of Rhode Island E 9-1-1 Uniform Emergency Telephone System (RI E 9-1-1) maintains a single statewide master point address file that it makes available to the public via the Rhode Island Geographic Information System (RIGIS) consortium. Quarterly extracts from the RI E 9-1-1 database are delivered to RIGIS and immediately made available to the public through various distribution methods. Currently these include the ability to download the data from the RIGIS website, and to view the data using Web Map Services (WMS) and an online digital atlas. The University of Rhode Island Environmental Data Center (URI EDC) performs this function as part of an agreement with the State of Rhode Island Division of Planning (RIDOP). Please see http://www.edc.uri.edu/rigis/data/data.aspx?ISO=structure for a description of this dataset (search for "Sites - E-911"). Parcel and Owner data: These data are maintained by each municipality and made available according to each municipal government's protocols. There is currently no statewide inventory of land parcel mapping, nor municipal assessor Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal (CAMA) database extracts.

Question 65 - Does the State desire electronic document/plan review functionality as part of this project? If so, what business processes or record types will be enabled for electronic plan review? (i.e. Simple Residential Permits, Commercial Permits, etc.). Does the State plan to roll out electronic document/plan review functionality for all record types at once or phasing in record types over a specified timeframe?
Answer 65 - Yes, the State expects the vendor system to include electronic document/plan review for all permit types.

Question 66 - Is it required that the selected solution be 508c compliant?
Answer 66 - Yes.

Question 67 - In the Proposal Requirements spreadsheet, it is not required that the vendor indicate effort for requirements marked as configurable. Is there an assumption that the State and/or municipalities will be responsible for the configuration?
Answer 67 - Configuration effort will be discussed during the review of the vendor proposals. Clarification may be required by the vendors at that time.

Question 68 - Can you identify the requirements in the spreadsheet that are mandatory for Phase I?
Answer 68 - The priority listing, Columns D on the spreadsheet informs vendors as to critical requirements.

Question 69 - Please clarify why there is a requirement to support multiple payment gateways instead of a single processor for all financial transactions? If a customer wishes to do a refund, this may result in significant work for the State to manage across multiple processors. In addition, the customer would also see multiple transactions on their Statements, which may cause confusion.
Answer 69 - The desire is to have a single payment gateway, however the need to process payments through multiple payment gateways has been identified to support multiple municipalities.

Question 70 - How many concurrent users does the State anticipate will require access to the system at any one time?

Answer 70 - It is expected that there will be approximately 150 – 200 concurrent users at peak.

Question 71 - Regarding mobile computing, what is the device of choice for the field staff (i.e. iPad, tablet, smartphone, etc.?)
Answer 71 - The system should be able to run on an iPad or Android tablet.

Question 72 - Is the State interested in electronic plan review, the ability to red-line, comment, overlay & compare, and edit electronic plans? If so, how many plan reviewers would need this functionality?
Answer 72 - Yes, approximately 20 reviewers would need this functionality at the State level. It is expected that each municipality would have 3-4 reviewers as well.

Question 73 - Does the State want integration to other systems i.e. Finance, Document Management, etc? If so, please provide which system (s).
Answer 73 - The system should be able to be integrated with multiple payment gateways, as well as export documents and files in a number of formats.

Question 74 - If the State does have any data conversion needs, what staff resources does the State have to put the legacy data into a prescribed format, and then participate in the conversion process in the new system?
Answer 74 - The State would provide sufficient staff resources to convert legacy system into new system.

Question 75 - The RFP does not mention any data conversion for legacy applications. Requirement 5.041 references the system to accept historical data via a batch process, but does not reference the number of systems/types or data sources of this historical data. If there is any need to convert to legacy data?
Answer 75 - The Fire Marshal and Building Commissioner have Microsoft excel and access data that will require conversion. There may also be components of the new e-permitting system to link to data from the State's Financial System RIFANS (Rhode Island Financial Accounting Network).

Question 76 - Does the State currently have Adobe Acrobat X licenses or Adobe Acrobat 9 licenses that can be upgraded to Acrobat X? If so, do all the plan review personnel have licenses allocated to them for Acrobat Pro? If not, does the State have a volume price agreement of government rate agreement for the Adobe suite of products?
Answer 76 - That State has a number of Acrobat X licenses, as well as an agreement with Adobe. The State intends on using Brava software for plan review.